



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/783,558

02/20/2004

Robert F. Day

304666.01/MFCP.143750

7539

45809

7590

08/23/2010

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
(MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613

EXAMINER

TOLENTINO, RODERICK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2439

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/23/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/783,558	Applicant(s) DAY ET AL.	
	Examiner Roderick Tolentino	Art Unit 2439	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-25 and 27-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-25 and 27-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 13, 15 – 25 and 27 – 29 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 12 and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claim 19 and its dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 19, recites a computer accessible medium. However, the specification fails to specifically define what a computer accessible medium can be. To one of ordinary skill in the art a medium can be said to be a carrier wave or transmission media. The specification must be more specific to what the media can be. According to the MPEP a signal or transmission media can not be patentable subject matter.
4. Suggestion to applicant is to amend the claim and the specification to recite a **non transitory** computer readable media. In almost all of our applications this addition would not be new matter as a computer and software executing is explicitly disclosed and therefore inherently the Computer readable medium discloses. As all computer

readable medium are either transitory or non transitory adding this would also not be new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2002/0095591) in view of Beilinson et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2004/0003279).

7. As per claims 1, 12 and 19, Daniell teaches recognizing, at a computing device of a user, user input data relevant to a first application as a user choice setting associated with the first application, wherein the user choice setting determines at least one property of execution of at least one event of the first application (Daniell, Paragraphs 0008 and 0014, security profile with an original state with rules to prevent access to a computer), securing, at the computing device of the user, the user choice setting as a protected value using an access control indicator, wherein the access control indicator prohibits the second application from modifying the user choice setting associated with the first application without authorization from [[a]]the user (Daniell, Paragraph 0035, restores changes after its been detected the change was

Art Unit: 2439

unauthorized) and restoring, at the computing device of the user, the access control indicator to prohibit further modification by the second application of the user choice setting associated with the first application (Daniell, Paragraph 0035, restores changes after its been detected the change was unauthorized) but fails to teach receiving, at the computing device of the user, a request from the second application to modify the user choice setting associated with the first application; in response to receiving the request from the second application to modify the user choice setting associated with the first application, generating an approval user interface on the computing device of the user, the approval user interface requesting authorization from the user to modify the user choice setting associated with the first application to be consistent with the modification request received from the second application and receiving, at the computing device of the user, input from the user approving the modification of the user choice setting associated with the first application to be consistent with the modification request received from the second application; modifying, at the computing device of the user, the access control indicator to permit modification of the user choice setting associated with the first application to be consistent with the modification request received from the second application; modifying, at the computing device of the user, the user choice setting in accordance with the received user input. Beilinson teaches receiving, at the computing device of the user, a request from the second application to modify the user choice setting associated with the first application; in response to receiving the request from the second application to modify the user choice setting associated with the first application, generating an approval user interface on the computing device of the user,

the approval user interface requesting authorization from the user to modify the user choice setting associated with the first application to be consistent with the modification request received from the second application (Beilinson, Paragraph 0065, user queried for changes to the users settings) and receiving, at the computing device of the user, input from the user approving the modification of the user choice setting associated with the first application to be consistent with the modification request received from the second application; modifying, at the computing device of the user, the access control indicator to permit modification of the user choice setting associated with the first application to be consistent with the modification request received from the second application; modifying, at the computing device of the user, the user choice setting in accordance with the received user input (Beilinson, Paragraph 0065, user responds yes or no to the request).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Beilinson's user controls for a computer with Daniell's System for protecting a security profile of a computer system because it offers the advantage of having an administrator temporarily extend or restrict privileges when needed (Beilinson, Paragraph 0006).

8. Claims 2 – 8, 10, 11, 15 – 18, 20 – 25, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell et al. U.S. PG-Publication No.

(2002/0095591) and Beilinson et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2004/0003279) and in further view of Siegel et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2002/0143961).

9. As per claims 2 and 20, Daniell fails to teach wherein the user's computing device has an operating system with a registry and the protected value is a registry key stored in the registry and the access control indicator is an access control list (ACL) that has been initialized to prevent writing to the protected value. However, in analogous art Siegel teaches wherein the user's computing device has an operating system with a registry and the protected value is a registry key stored in the registry (Siegel, Paragraphs 0019 and 0020, user preferences stored in a database) and the access control indicator is an access control list (ACL) that has been initialized to prevent writing to the protected value (Siegel, Paragraph 0004 and 0039, user permissions stored in a database with modification settings, use of passwords protect an account).

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Siegel's access control protocol for user profile management with Daniell's System for protecting a security profile of a computer system because it offers the advantage of preventing access to certain permissions by unauthorized parties (Siegel, Paragraph 0008).

10. As per claims 3, 16 and 21, Daniell as modified teaches herein the user's computing device has an operating system with a registry and modifying the access control indicator to permit writing to the protected value includes providing to the user rights to modify the ACL in accordance with the security subsystem of the operating system (Siegel, Paragraphs 0020 and 0026, once a party whether the user or

administrator is verified or authenticated, changes to the settings maybe made thus taking a way any protection indicators).

11. As per claims 4, 17 and 22, Daniell as modified teaches modifying the access control indicator to permit writing to the protected value includes providing to the user ownership of the registry key that the ACL secures, wherein ownership of the registry key automatically provides to the user rights to modify the ACL in accordance with the security subsystem of the operating system (Siegel, Paragraph 0026, once a party whether the user or administrator is verified or authenticated, changes to the settings maybe made thus taking a way any protection indicators).

12. As per claims 5, 18 and 23, Daniell as modified teaches modifying the access control indicator to permit writing to the protected value includes allowing the user to temporarily take ownership of the registry key that the ACL secures after receiving the input from the user authorizing the application to modify the user choice setting on the user's behalf (Siegel, Paragraph 0026, once a party whether the user or administrator is verified or authenticated, changes to the settings maybe made thus taking a way any protection indicators).

13. As per claim 6, Daniell as modified teaches restoring the access control indicator to prevent writing to the protected value includes removing user rights to modify the ACL in accordance with the security subsystem of the operating system (Siegel, 0026, inherent that once a user or administrator is done modifying the profile the user or administrator will log out and the profile will be protected from modifications until another party is verified and authenticated) and herein modifying the access control

indicator to permit modification of the user choice setting associated with the first application to be consistent with the modification request received from the second application includes modifying the access control indicator to permit the second application to write to the protected value (Daniell, Paragraph 0014, security application monitors changes in the security profile application if there are changes, if there a changes the application will change the security profile back to its original state).

14. As per claims 7 and 25, Daniell as modified teaches removing user rights to modify the ACL includes returning ownership of the registry key that the ACL secures to the operating system (Siegel, 0026, inherent that once a user or administrator is done modifying the profile the user or administrator will log out and the profile will be protected from modifications until another party is verified and authenticated).

15. As per claims 8, Daniell as modified teaches generating a user choice setting user interface (UI), displaying the current user choice setting on the UI along with other options for the user choice setting (Siegel, Paragraph 0026, interface for user to modify settings) and receiving input from the user approving the modification of the user choice setting comprises receiving input from the user in accordance with at least one of the displayed options (Beilinson, Paragraph 0065, user responds yes or no to the request).

16. As per claims 10 and 28, Daniell as modified teaches the user choice settings of a task association, this choice being one of the options listed by the applicant's claim language (Siegel, Paragraph 0004, user can change permissions regarding the task of what clients have access to).

17. As per claims 11, 15 and 29, Daniell as modified teaches the registered client setting includes at least one of a Web browser, this choice being one of the options listed by the applicant's claim language (Siegel, Paragraph 0026, web browser).

18. As per claim 24, Daniell as modified teaches the instruction to lock the ACL to prevent writing to the protected value includes an instruction to remove user rights to modify the ACL in accordance with the security subsystem of the operating system (Siegel, 0026, inherent that once a user or administrator is done modifying the profile the user or administrator will log out and the profile will be protected from modifications until another party is verified and authenticated).

19. Claims 9, 13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2002/0095591) and Beilinson et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2004/0003279) in view of Siegel et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2002/0143961) and in view of Giordano, III et al. U.S. Patent No, (6,370,141).

20. As per claims 9, and 27, Daniell fails to teach generating a change notification to the user whenever the user choice setting has been modified, the change notification identifying the application that modified the user setting and the contents of the protected value before and after the modification. However, in an analogous art Giordano teaches generating a change notification to the user whenever the user choice setting has been modified, the change notification identifying the application that modified the user setting and the contents of the protected value before and after the modification (Giordano, Col. 4, Lines 15 – 24, user notification of changes).

At the time the invention was made, it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Giordano's apparatus for configuring internet appliance with Daniell's System for protecting a security profile of a computer system because it offers the advantage of letting a user know of changed made to a system (Giordano, Col. 4, Lines 15 – 24, user notification of changes).

21. As per claim 13, Daniell as modified teaches wherein the approval user interface writes to the protected value the modified user choice setting (Beilinson, Paragraph 0065, user responds yes or no to the request), wherein the approval user interface restores the ACL to prevent writing to the protected value in the registry key after writing the modified user choice setting and wherein the approval user interface notifies the user whenever the approval user interface writes to the protected value, including notifying the user of a content of the protected value before and after the approval user interface writes to the protected value and an identity of the application that requested the modification (Giordano, Col. 4, Lines 15 – 24, user notification of changes).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roderick Tolentino whose telephone number is (571) 272-2661. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2439

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Roderick Tolentino
Examiner
Art Unit 2439

/R. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2439

/Edan Orgad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2439